



Interview Summary

Application No. 08/690,136

BRADY ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Eashoo, PhD.

Group Art Unit 1732

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) Mark Eashoo, PhD.	(3) # 15
(2) Douglas W. Miller	(4)
Date of Interview 20 Jan 1999	
Type: 🛮 Telephonic 🗆 Personal (copy is given to 🗀 applicant 🗀 applicant's representative).	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes N	o. If yes, brief description:
Agreement was reached. was not reached.	
Claim(s) discussed: 1-11	·
Identification of prior art discussed: That cited.	
films will replace Sneed et al.	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	
1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate	record of the substance of the interview.
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.	
each of the objections, rejections and requirements the claims are now allowable, this completed form is con-	ding any attachments) reflects a complete response to nat may be present in the last Office action, and since the sidered to fulfill the response requirements of the last g a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.	